without faith. When the young man said to Christ, "Good master," the Saviour replied, "Why do you call me good? there is none good but one, and that is God;" by which he intimated that goodness in perfection is only to be found in God. There is a morality which some men boast of apart from Christian morality. Tinsel may shine more brightly than pure gold. There are many persons who are golden at the heart, yet in their exterior they are pernaps narrow-minded and unattractive. There are others, who give to the poor, who are apparently models of virtue, who let no occasion pass to be equal to others in generosity and kindness, yet in their hearts they are foul, unjust and wedde! to vice. The moral virtue flows from religion as streams from a fountain or rays from the sun. A good man is a godly man, an honest man. He will not cheart you, he will not defrand the government. As a merchant you can rely on his word, as a minister he will not shrinks from promulgating the trails though it be unpopular, nor pander to wrong though it be popular. A good man, if he enters

THE AREMA OF POLITICS,
will maintain his integrity even if he lose his office, for he disdams a place obtained by fraud or held by bribery. Neither will he permit others to be dishonest for him. We always find some good men in office, showing that God takes care of R is people. The good man tolerates other seets, but he never participates in their errors. He always has a kind word for those in distress; he stretches out his hand to tke needy; he raises up the wretched. He puts not out his money to usury, nor does he take a reward against the innocent. He incurs no obligations which he has not a hope of fulfilling, for he knows that a failure to fulfilling to the needy; he rolessed and the moral virtues. How can a man who believes in a God and

Who giveth in the victory, through our Lord Jesus

CENTRAL PRESSYTERIAN CHURCH.

Sermon by Rev. A. W. Pitzer.

Sermon by Rev. A. W. Pitzer.

Washington, May 29, 1870.

At the Central Presbyterian church, in the Columbian Law Building, the discourse to-day was delivered by Rev. A. W. Pitzer, whose text was taken from Romans vil., 24—"0, wretched man that I am; who shall deliver me from the body of, this death?" The latter portion of this chapter, said the preacher, is expressive of the experience of Saul of Taraus after his conversion. If any man is competent to give correct information upon the subject of religion that man is the Apostle Paul, the author of this Epistle to the Romans. He was a Jew of pure blood.

give correct information upon the subject of religion that man is the Apostle Paul, the author of this Epistle to the Romans. He was a Jew of pure blood, a Pharisec, a rigid observer of the civil ceremonial moral law; but when he saw Jesus and became a converted man he finds that all his legalism, formalism and self-righteousness had been vain. Henceforth he

TRUSTS ONLY IN THE BLOOD OF JESUS CHRIST, which ceanseth from all sin. In the text he gives expression to his feelings as a converted sinner striving after holiness of heart and purity of life—"O, wretched man that I am?" From this text we learn, first, that the Christian is not a siniess being. No such thing as siniess perfection exists. No saint whose life is recorded in the Bible ever claimed it. The angel said:—"Coll His named Jesus, because He shall save His people from their sina." The Christian is one who expects to be saved from all his sinispy the Lord Jesus. Noah, Abraham, Moses, David, Peter, all sinned and are sinners saved by grace. Every believer has some sin in heart or life to bewail.

SINLESS TERFECTION

is the standard, the goal, the end. Second, the Christian, though not sinless, is ever striving against sin. He hates sin, shuns sin. In his soul there are two forces—the power of good and the power of evil—sin and holiness, the new nature and the old man. The mightlest contests of earth fade into insignificance when compared with these soul battles hid from mortal gaze. The Issues of the one end in time; the issues of the other endure through eternity, Third—In this conflict the Christian grouns with the burden of his indwelling sin. Eastern tyrnnts bound living prisoners to dead bodies, and compelled the living to bear the corpse until death ended the agony. The aposite compares this undwelling sin to the dead body, and groans to be delivered. The true child of God prays and pants FOR DELYVERANCE FROM IMPURITY, imperfection and delivered at hist, I thank Ged, through Jesus Christ is more powerful than Satan, and grace is stronger tha

children to refrain from all incestuous marriages? Is the Rev. Dr. Newman prepared to defend the conclusions of his own logic? Mustail generations from Adam to Moose be limited in marriage to blood relations of the nearest degree—namely, brothers and sisters—because it was so in the second generation and no provision made to avoid-it?

The great principle which our Lord wished to enforce upon the corrupt Jews, whom he was addressing, was the sanctity of marriage in that the creation of male and fomale clearly indicated His design for the multiplication of the human species; that Moses, because of the wickedness of the people, permitted divorces; that He, the Saviour, abrogated the unjust law of divorce and condemned as adultery the wicked practice which then existed to an siarming extent of putting away one wife without sufficient cause in order to gratify their beastly, lusts in marrying another.

SUCH WICKED, REARTLESS MARRIAGES, preceded by the monstrous crueity of divorce, were only to be recognized in the catalogue of crimes. It could not be said of such marriages, "What Gol hath joined together let no man put asunder." They were no part of the divine institution, and therefore were adulterous and the children bastards; while, on the other hand, the polygamist, who honorably kept his wives and maintained them, and did not put them away, though he added other wives to his peaceful family circle, was approbated of God and free from the sin of adultery, and his children were not bastards, but legitimate and blessed of God, as is abundantly proved in the divine oracles.

After having made several unproved assumptions in the form of cenunciation against polygamy, the reverend doctor says:—

I shall now proceed to prove that God's law condemns the union in marriage of more than two persons.

Which are the laws that seem to send the masself, then shall he to the masself, then shall he to the masself, then shall not diminish. The take him and her duty of marriage, he shall not diminish. The take him and her futty

stood women; for we nowhere read that Saul had more taan one wife, whose name was Ahlaosin. Rispals was a second wife, or, at most, his county to the second wife, or, at most, his county to the protection. Attractive was carried, was a place of protection figuratively expressed. It does not mean that they became his wives. The Hebrew word nausheen is translated "wives" in numerous places in the Scriptures. (See Genesis, iv., is and 23; also Deut, xxi., 15).

Will Should Me. NewMan Object to the usual rendering in the above passage? Did not the inspired judges and leaders of israel generally have many wives. Was it not his class of mere that they became his wives were not provided that the selfmation of Mr. Newman, be an exception? David certainly was worth yof Saul's wives, as a gift from the hands of God, into his own person; for before he was exalted to the throne of Israel he only had eight wives. God understanding the faithfunces of David, while deeing before his heartless persecutor, and having proved him to be a man after his own heart; felt willing to give the wives of Saul into his boson, and, if that had been too little, the Lord informs him that He would have gived most of Xathen were confirmed by "the Lord God of Israel," who testified that He litimest gave these wives to him, and assigns this as a reason why he should not have taken the "one little ewe lamb." He words of Xathen were confirmed by "the Lord God of Israel," who testified that He litimest gave these wives to him, and assigns this as a reason why he should not have taken the "one little ewe lamb." He words of Xathen were confirmed by "the Lord God of Israel," who testified that He litimest gave these wives to him, and assigns this as a reason why he should not have taken that which did not belong to him, and which the Lord had roof given him entire the protection of the protection of the heart had roof given him entire the protection of the same that he not only commanded, under certain circumsances, a plurality of wives, but denominates

hurt.

The reverent doctor continues:—"This is the only instance of polygany recorded in the Scriptures during the first two thousand years after the institution of marriage; and we judge from the record that both Lamech and those around him considered it a crime." It is admitted that Lamech became a murderer; but did he murder in defence of polygamy? No; there is not the least intimation to that one of the control of the

gamy? No; there is not the least intimation to that effect. This is ONE OF THE VALSE CHARGES Of this reverend divine to embitter the minds of the public against a Bible institution. Does Mr. Newman wish to assert that because murder was a crime therefore polygamy must be a crime? Let us carry out this gentleman's logic a little further. Cain was a murderer, and he had but one wife; therefore monogamy was a crime. Such would be the result of such reasoning.

Another specimen of his logic is tast there is no record of any other polygamous family for 2,000 years. In reply, we say that there was no record of monogamous marriages, only in three cases, from Adam to Nouh. Does Mr. Newman suppose that this silence of history in regard to the marriage institution condemns either the monogamic or polygamic form of marriage? Abraham is next referred to:—

committed in defence of polygamy. Genesis iv., 23:—

And Lamech said unto him two wives. * And Lamech said unto his wives, Adah and Zillah, hear my voice; pe wives of Lamech, hearken unto my speech; for have sials a man to my wounding, and a young man to my instance of polygamy recorded in the Scriptures during the first two thousand years after the insittatian of marriage; and we judge from the record that both Lamech and those around him considered it a crime." It is admitted that Lamech became a murderer; but did he murder in defence of polygamy? No; there is not the least intimation to that effect. This is

The Lord restrained Leah from bearing until she would follow the righteous example of her sister. "When Leah saw that she had left bearing she took Zilpah, her maid, and gave Jacob to wife. And Zilpah, her maid, bare Jacob a son." (Genesis xxx., 9, 10.) Did God bless Rachel and Leah for these acts? Let the Scriptures answer:—

God remembered Rachel, and God bearkened to her and opened her womb. And she conceived and bare a son; and said, God hath taken away my reproach. And she called his name Joseph; and said, The Lord shall add to me another son. (Genesis xxx., 23, 24, 24).

In the seventeenth and eighteenth verses it

In the seventeenth and eighteenth verses it reads:—

And God bearkened unto Leab, and are conceived and barr Jacob the fifth son. And Leab said, God hain given me my hire, because I have given my maiden to my bushand.

In a like manner God restrained Sarah from bearing until she gave Hagar to Abraham, after which he blessed both wives with a son each. God was so well pleased with their polygamy that he wrought these three special miracles in conformation of the divine institution:—

If POLYGAMY WEBE A CRIME how remarkably strange is I've language, "God firsth given me my hrre, boeanse I have given my mailers to my husband." When Hagar fiet from the house of Abraham she was met by an angel, who commanded her to the composite of polygamic, that a polygamic woman should be visited by an angel and be outside to return to her polygamic home. Instead of reproving her for entering into polygamy, and requiring her henceforth to keep away from it, he sends her back to her polygamics husband and mistress, saying, "I will multiply thy seed exceedingly, that it shall not be numbered for multitude." On another occasion the angel of the Lord fold her that her son Ishmael should become "a great nation," "God was with the lad," and he begot twelve princes. At these facts, and many others too numerous to mount with the comprise the begot the conspring thus begotten. While adultery was punished with death, and children begotten out or wed-lock branded with infamy to the tonth generation, polygamists and their children were highly honored of the Lord. The child of David begotten unto it wellock branded with infamy to the tonth generation, polygamists and their children were highly honored of the Lord. The child of David begotten unto its with the same woman lawfully, the word of the Lord. The child same with the same woman lawfully, the word of the comming the from her polygamy that he word of the comming the misses and the remainded with the land of the comming the from heaven to consume the sacrifice. Thus did he honor this full polygamist woman with the polygamy will be honore

punished.

But is it right or just, or in accordance with our free institutions, to punish a religious society for embracing in their religious faith a holy and divine institution, believed in and practised by the most of men—by inspired prophets and revelators, woose sacred writings are revered by all Caristian nations—an institution established in the divine oracles by divine command, regulated by divine law, acknowledged by angels and confirmed by miracles? The Bible is the great

revered by all Curistian nations—an institution established in the divine oracles by divine command, regulated by divine law, acknowledged by angels and confirmed by miracies? The Bible is the great

STANDARD OF MORALS.

In it the great crimes against God and against society are clearly named and denounced, it is the acknowledged foundation on which civilized nations have erected the grand superstructure of criminal law for the universal protection of society. If heathenish religion should find its way into our land and should demand that a widow must be ourned on the funcral pile of her husband, our laws, supported by this divine standard, would speak in tones of thunder against it, saying, "Thou shalt not kill," "He that killeth shall die." If under the pratended garb of reigion marriage should be abolished and an indiscriminate intercourse of the sexes should be inculcated, the voice of legislation, sustained by the divine code, should speak in thrilling tones of terror to such loathsome wretches, saying, "Thou shalt not comain adutery." If theth, or infanticide or any other crime demounced in the divine law were incorporated in a religious creed and practised under the sacred mame of religion the laws of our country should be structly enforced against them and the offenders be punished. But because the people have wisely entrasted these great safeguards of the peace and good order of society in the bands of their representatives and legislative and legislate against any religious doctrine or institution sanctioned by the Bibbe? If the sacred institution is another than a serious and the sacred institution is a serious and the other form may not eventually share the same late?

WHAT ASSURANCE HAYE WE
that baptism, the Lord's Supper or any other divine right will not be denounced criminal and utterly abolished what assurance have we shat the other form may not eventually share the same late?

WHAT ASSURANCE HAYE WE
that baptism, the Lord's Supper or any other divine right will not be denounced by some future

ble age exceeds that of the males by many thousands.

THESE SURPLUS PEMALES
have emigrated here because of their peculiar religious views. They are unwilling to leave the Territory to seek husbands eisewhere. No earthly consideration could persuade them to marry outside of the Church of which they are members. Such marriages, they consider, would be equivalent to a denial of their faith, and, they believe, would greatly endanger their salvation. Have not these women the natural instincts of their sex? Do they not desire to become honorable wives and joyful mothers of children? Would they not infinitely prefer a plural form of marriage than to have no husbands at all? Why, then, should special legislation be extended over Utah to prevent thousands of ladies from participating in the empoyment of Scriptural mairimony, to deprive them of the family circles and homes of their choice?

I CANNOT, I WILL NOT BELIEVE,

until I am compelled so to do, that the great and illustrious statesmen of our renowned republic will be so ungenerous, so un-ympathizing to American ladies as to deny them their natural, civil and religious rights, and condemn them to perpetual celibracy. Yours, most respectfully.

OHSON PRATT, SE.